



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

"It cannot be denied that there has been a positive tendency in Japan to regard military force as a universal panacea for all international ills. In the past Japan has frequently had recourse to military force in international questions, but the general tendency of the world has now changed, since the great war has demonstrated beyond a doubt that a strong army and navy can hardly guarantee the ascendancy of a country. If military force could satisfactorily solve all international questions, such problems as the Shantung question and the China boycott would have been settled long ago."

It appears also that Mr. Nagashima, member of the Diet, has demanded the establishment of a Foreign Relations Committee, an innovation indeed.

But the remarkable thing about the whole situation seems to be the wide welcome from the public at large and by the press to the views thus expressed against the militarists.

COMPULSORY UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING

THE LATEST formal action by Congress relative to the plan to have compulsory universal military training of the youth of the United States "side steps" the issue. Two factors of the situation have caused this performance: the condition of the Treasury and the disinclination of the party managers to have any additional complexity added to an already tangled and disturbed state of affairs in a vexing presidential campaign.

With estimates of the cost of the innovation—in times of peace—ranging anywhere from \$700,000,000 to \$1,000,000,000 annually, lawmakers who live in fear of irate and already heavily burdened taxpayers, and who know from the estimates of expert congressional and Treasury officials that the government faces a deficit of from three to five billion dollars next year, are not prepared to back the "militarists" who wish peace conscription.

As for the politicians, they have begun to hear from the farmers, the manual workers, the "intelligentzia," the women, and the returned soldiers. The latter, it was supposed, would be strong supporters of the project. Some of them are, but more of them are not. Their experiences in Europe and in the home camps have been educational. Like the rank and file of the British and French armies, they are "fed up" on war and cannot be counted upon for future offensive action or for loyalty to a military policy.

If many of the candidates for the Presidency could have their way, they would avoid taking sides on this issue now. But the supporters of the candidacy of General Wood, of the United States Army, do not intend to let them evade facing the issue. He does not. He is for

the plan—body, mind, heart, and soul. They want to know whether his rivals are, and they keep writing formal letters to the would-be neutrals.

Their tactics are quite legitimate. We trust that the Wood backers will continue to prod until they get some positive answers. The electors in this campaign have a right to know what the several candidates think. Planks in party platforms illuminate the way partly; but it is in the man more than in the platform that voters are now most interested; for a platform may be ignored or forgotten; but a man of the requisite presidential age does not change his spots. If he is a leopard, he remains so.

THE REAL RUSSIA

SINCE we last went to press the Russia of the Soviets has so strengthened itself in a military way that there is no longer any formidable military opposition to it within the nation, nor any disposition of the Allied Powers further to spend money, supplies, and men in aiding elements of the population that resist the Soviet control. Nor is this all. Great Britain, Italy, and France, to a less degree, have informally, if not formally, agreed to quasi-recognition of the State dominated by Lenin and Trotsky; and Japan and the United States have agreed in this, at least, that they are withdrawing troops from Siberia and letting the situation take what shape it will along Russian nationalistic lines.

These governmental decisions, so pregnant with importance, because pointing toward cessation of internal Russian strife and also toward a radical alteration of the economic condition of Europe and northern Asia, have been arrived at partly because of necessity and partly because of the appeals of reason or commercial cupidity. The masses of the people in the Allied and Associated nations will not support further warfare against the Russian masses. Moreover, all latest reports from Russia indicate a greater degree of political stability and economic health there than conservative journals and their correspondents have been willing to report and admit. Last, but not least, the Russian market is vast, and priority of entrance into the field means much wealth to the pioneer trading nation.

Having decided no longer to "kick against the pricks," Europe has at last agreed to do what she should have done years ago, namely, send into Russia a representative commission backed with the moral support of the nations interested. Reliance in part upon the Labor Section of the League of Nations is interesting. Delegates so appointed may command treatment from the Soviet government that a commission of "intellectuals," professional public officials, or diplomats of the old school

could probably not count upon. We hope the men sent will be of a moderate and not a radical type; that they will know what to seek for in the way of information and how to interpret it when they find it.

"Real Russia" has been a *terra incognita* to the world since the Revolution, so narrowly partisan and class-conscious have been most of the investigators and commentators who have pretended to tell the world what really was being done in the vast Slavic domain. Honest-minded visitors have too often been denied expression. Governments have relied too exclusively on "intelligence" officers with an almost inevitable bias, owing to their class affiliations and economic preferences. Radicals have gone daft over experiments that had a Utopian dress but a gross body within the libertarian attire. For lack of light, partisans of monarchy, constitutional representative government, and democracy with the group as the basic unit, have been bespattering each other with mud. Powers that controlled navies have kept up a blockade that has put an end to the lives of hundreds of thousands of non-combatants. Wounds have been made that will leave permanent scars, reminding former friends among the nations that they have been enemies, as, for instance, Russia beset by republican France and the United States.

The chapter is one discrediting human nature, political idealism, "open diplomacy," and 20th century journalism.

TAKE NOT THE OPPORTUNITY FROM FRANCE

INTERNATIONAL magnanimity towards central Europe can be initiated only by France.

It is complained, especially by such persons as Mr. Maynard Keynes, in his "The Economic Consequences of Peace," and by Norman Angell, in his "The Peace Treaty and the Economic Chaos of Europe," that M. Clemenceau was opposed to Mr. Wilson's fourteen points, and that throughout the Peace Conference at Paris he drove steadily at one object, namely, to render Germany impotent by means of accumulative poverty and famine. It is pointed out that the population of Germany has increased since 1870 from forty million to nearly seventy million. To feed such a population from within her own borders or to obtain sufficient raw materials from her own resources is impossible. The impressive manufacturing activity of Germany is dependent upon imports. The Paris Treaty aims to cripple Germany's manufacturing industry by making it impossible for her to import either food or raw materials; because, since modern manufacturing depends upon coal, iron, and transportation, M. Clemenceau's statesman-

ship at Paris was bent upon making it impossible for Germany to obtain coal, iron, or transports. It is argued that Germany requires 140,000,000 tons of coal yearly if she is to renew her manufacturing on a scale equal to that of 1914. The loss of the coal mines of the Saar Valley, the obligation of Germany to furnish coal to France, Italy, and to other allies, and the reduction of Germany's territory has reduced the annual coal supply in Germany to 60,000,000 tons. Germany's loss of Alsace-Lorraine means a reduction of three-fourths of her iron supply. Under the terms of the treaty, Germany's mercantile marine practically disappears from the seas. In the light of these facts, Professor Starling reported, in his official calculations, to the British Government that Germany is in position at the present moment to feed less than one-half of her population. Because of her losses in coal, iron, and means of transportation, it is believed that if the present terms of the treaty are enforced that 15,000,000 of the German people will starve to death.

We are presented thus with a distressing picture indeed. Instead of an increasing birth rate, Germany is already face to face with a declining birth rate. Babies are fed a mixture of spinach and water, because neither milk nor other food can be had. New-born children are wrapped in newspapers for the want of other clothes. We are presented with the picture of "starving women tearing in pieces a horse fallen in the street, and eating its raw flesh; the appearance of tuberculosis in shapes hitherto unprecedented, attacking the whole body simultaneously and finally manifesting itself in purulent dissolution." As an economic proposition we are asked, What is to become of this country? It was the best customer of Italy, Belgium, Norway, Holland, Switzerland, and Russia; the second best customer of Great Britain; the third best customer of France. Mr. Norman Angell uses these ominous words:

"A moment's reflection should convince us that a racially and nationally cohesive block of seventy millions, with a gift for discipline and organization, surrounded by smaller States, most of whom are in bitter conflict with one another, cannot be condemned to slow starvation. Somehow, somewhere, they would find a means of breaking out of their prison. By our action we should have given them a righteous cause for war. Then, indeed, they would be fighting for their homes, their women-folk, their little ones, and the war would be waged by a ferocity measured by the ferocity of the doctrine—our doctrine—against which it would be a revolt."

We have no doubt of the substantial accuracy of this picture and we agree that it is terrible. On the top of it all is the new spirit of revenge, transferred now to Germany. The dangers along the Rhine persist. What is to be done?